

Cosmic Microwave Background Dipole induced by double inflation

David Langlois

*Département d'Astrophysique Relativiste et de Cosmologie,
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique,
Observatoire de Paris, 92195 Meudon, France
and
Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University,
Givat Ram, 91904 Jerusalem, Israel.*

Abstract

The observed CMBR dipole is generally interpreted as the consequence of the peculiar motion of the Sun with respect to the reference frame of the CMBR. This article proposes an alternative interpretation in which the observed dipole is the result of isocurvature perturbations on scales larger than the present Hubble radius. These perturbations are produced in the simplest model of double inflation, depending on three parameters. The observed dipole and quadrupole can be explained in this model, while severely constraining its parameters.

The dipole moment is the most distinctive feature in the Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation (CMBR) anisotropy [1]. It is larger than the quadrupole, measured recently by the satellite COBE, by two orders of magnitude. In general, this dipole is interpreted as the peculiar motion of the Sun with respect to the CMBR “rest frame”, whereas the other multipoles are seen as a consequence of primordial cosmological perturbations of a homogeneous and isotropic universe.

The satellite COBE has measured a dipole corresponding to a velocity of $369 \pm 3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ([2]). Subtracting the motion of the sun in the galaxy and the motion of our galaxy with respect to the local group, one ends up with a net dipole, which, if interpreted as a Doppler effect, yields a velocity for the local group of $627 \pm 22 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ towards the galactic coordinates ($l = 276^\circ \pm 3^\circ, b = 33^\circ \pm 3^\circ$). However, although rarely mentioned, the measured dipole is *not necessarily* due to a Doppler effect ([3],[4], [5]). If

the dipole is only due to our peculiar motion, then one should expect a similar dipole in other cosmological observations. But such observations are inconclusive up to now: whereas the measured dipoles from the X-ray background [6], from nearby galaxies [7], from IRAS galaxies [8] and from distant supernovae [9] are compatible with the COBE observation within the statistical errors, the observed dipole in distant Abell clusters [10] (561 ± 284 km s⁻¹ towards $(l = 220^\circ \pm 27^\circ, b = -28^\circ \pm 27^\circ)$) is inconsistent with the CMBR dipole. One cannot therefore reject the possibility that the CMBR dipole is incompatible with our peculiar motion.

Recently, Langlois and Piran [5] have shown that the CMBR dipole could be the result of isocurvature perturbations on scales larger than the current Hubble radius, but *only with wavelengths bigger than a critical scale of the order of a hundred times the Hubble radius today* to avoid a quadrupole incompatible with observations. Observationally, the measured CMBR dipole would then be the vectorial sum of the isocurvature dipole plus the peculiar motion dipole. It could thus be completely different from the other cosmological dipoles, which are sensitive only to our peculiar motion.

The purpose of this article is to propose a scenario that explains the *origin* of isocurvature perturbations with such an abrupt lower cut-off in their spectrum. It is based on the simplest model of multiple inflation: two non-interacting massive scalar fields. Although most of the pioneering works on inflation considered only one scalar field, it was noticed early that inflation with several scalar fields (motivated by various models of grand unification in particle physics) could induce *isocurvature* perturbations (see e.g. [11]). However, the original motivation for “double inflation” ([12]) was to tailor a non-flat spectrum of *adiabatic* perturbations that could reconcile various observations of large-scale structures. This spectrum was recently reinvestigated in great detail by Polarski and Starobinsky ([13]).

Here, the very same ingredients of double inflation are going to be used, but with a special emphasis on isocurvature perturbations, and most essentially, by assuming that the break in double inflation, i.e. the transition between inflation driven by the heavy scalar field and inflation driven by the light scalar field, takes place at scales corresponding today to scales far larger than the Hubble radius.

The simplest model of double inflation, consisting of two minimally coupled massive scalar fields, is described by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{{}^{(4)}R}{16\pi G} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi_l\partial^\mu\phi_l - \frac{1}{2}m_l^2\phi_l^2 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi_h\partial^\mu\phi_h - \frac{1}{2}m_h^2\phi_h^2, \quad (1)$$

where ϕ_l and ϕ_h are respectively the light and heavy scalar fields ($m_l < m_h$); ${}^{(4)}R$ is the scalar spacetime curvature and G is Newton’s constant. The equations of motion in a flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW)

spacetime, with the metric $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)d\mathbf{x}^2$, are given by

$$3H^2 = 4\pi G \left(\dot{\phi}_l^2 + \dot{\phi}_m^2 + m_l^2 \phi_l^2 + m_h^2 \phi_h^2 \right), \quad (2)$$

$$\ddot{\phi}_l + 3H\dot{\phi}_l + m_l^2 \phi_l = 0, \quad \ddot{\phi}_h + 3H\dot{\phi}_h + m_h^2 \phi_h = 0, \quad (3)$$

where a dot denotes a derivative with respect to the cosmic time t , and $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. One assumes initial conditions such that $m_h \ll H$; $\phi_h, \phi_l \gg m_P/\sqrt{2\pi}$ ($m_P \equiv G^{-1/2}$ is the Planck mass), so that one begins with inflation ($|\dot{H}| \ll H^2$) where both scalar fields are slow-rolling.

Following the analysis of [13], the two scalar fields, in the slow-rolling approximation ($\dot{\phi}_l^2$ and $\dot{\phi}_h^2$ are neglected in (2), $\ddot{\phi}_l$ and $\ddot{\phi}_h$ in (3)), can be written in the form

$$\phi_h^2 = \frac{s}{2\pi G} \sin^2 \theta, \quad \phi_l^2 = \frac{s}{2\pi G} \cos^2 \theta, \quad (4)$$

where $s = -\ln(a/a_e)$ (“e” stands for the end of inflation). Their evolution is given parametrically by [13]

$$s = s_0 \left[\frac{(\sin \theta) m_l^2}{(\cos \theta) m_h^2} \right]^{\frac{2}{m_h^2 - m_l^2}}, \quad H^2(s) = \frac{1}{3} s \left[m_h^2 + m_l^2 - (m_h^2 - m_l^2) \cos 2\theta(s) \right], \quad (5)$$

where s_0 is a constant of integration.

Assume now $m_h/m_l \gg 1$. In this model, several epochs can be distinguished. It will be convenient to label them according to the value of the comoving Hubble length scale, defined by $\lambda(t) = (a(t)H(t))^{-1}$. The initial period of inflation driven by the heavy scalar field lasts until equality of the energies of the two scalar fields ($m_h \phi_h = m_l \phi_l$), which occurs for $\theta \simeq m_l/m_h$ and $s \simeq s_0$. The Hubble scale at that time will be denoted λ_b (for “break”). If the condition $s_0 > (m_h/m_l)^2$ is satisfied, which will be assumed here, inflation goes on, now driven by the light scalar field (if not, there is a dust-like transition period before the second phase of inflation, see [13] for details). Meanwhile the heavy scalar field continues its slow-rolling until $H \sim m_h$, after which it oscillates. The Hubble scale corresponding to the end of the slow-rolling of ϕ_h will be denoted λ_c (for “critical”). Finally the Hubble parameter reaches the value m_l and inflation stops. In the “standard” model of double inflation, the scales λ_b and λ_c (one always has $\lambda_b > \lambda_c$) are within the Hubble radius today, denoted λ_H , ([12], [13]) whereas, here, the parameters of the model are chosen such that these two scales are *outside* the present Hubble radius λ_H .

Let us now study the perturbations around the background solution given above. In the longitudinal gauge the scalar perturbations of the metric reduce to the “relativistic gravitational potential” perturbation Φ , so that the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = -(1 + 2\Phi)dt^2 + a^2(t)(1 - 2\Phi)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j. \quad (6)$$

The perturbations for the scalar fields are denoted $\delta\phi_h$ and $\delta\phi_l$.

From now on, all the perturbations will be decomposed into Fourier modes, defined for any field $f(\mathbf{x})$ by

$$f_{\mathbf{k}} = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{x}}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}), \quad (7)$$

and the subscript $\mathbf{k}$ will be most of the time implicit.

In the limit of small k , there exists a solution for Φ corresponding to the adiabatic growing mode which is independent of the specific matter content, and can be expressed, quite generally, as

$$\Phi = C_1 \left(1 - \frac{H}{a} \int_0^t a dt' \right), \quad (8)$$

where $C_1(\mathbf{k})$ is time independent.

The perturbed Einstein equations yield the evolution equations for the perturbations, which read:

$$\dot{\Phi} + H\Phi = 4\pi G \left(\dot{\phi}_h \delta\phi_h + \dot{\phi}_l \delta\phi_l \right), \quad (9)$$

$$\delta\ddot{\phi}_h + 3H\delta\dot{\phi}_h + \left(\frac{k^2}{a^2} + m_h^2 \right) \delta\phi_h = 4\dot{\phi}_h \dot{\Phi} - 2m_h^2 \phi_h \Phi, \quad (10)$$

with a similar equation for $\delta\phi_l$. When the two scalar fields are slow-rolling, the dominant solutions for the long wavelength modes ($k \ll aH$) are given by

$$\Phi = -\frac{C_1 \dot{H}}{H^2} + 2C_3 \frac{(m_h^2 - m_l^2)m_h^2\phi_h^2 m_l^2\phi_l^2}{3(m_h^2\phi_h^2 + m_l^2\phi_l^2)^2}, \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\delta\phi_l}{\dot{\phi}_l} = \frac{C_1}{H} - 2C_3 \frac{Hm_h^2\phi_h^2}{m_h^2\phi_h^2 + m_l^2\phi_l^2}, \quad \frac{\delta\phi_h}{\dot{\phi}_h} = \frac{C_1}{H} + 2C_3 \frac{Hm_l^2\phi_l^2}{m_h^2\phi_h^2 + m_l^2\phi_l^2}, \quad (12)$$

where $C_1(\mathbf{k})$ (the same as in (8)) and $C_3(\mathbf{k})$ are time independent. The terms with C_1 will give later (in the radiation era) the adiabatic growing mode, whereas the terms proportional to C_3 will give the non-decaying isocurvature mode.

The initial conditions are obtained from the vacuum quantum fluctuations of the two independent fields $\delta\phi_h$ and $\delta\phi_l$. Following the same procedure as for inflation with one scalar field, one finds that $\delta\phi_h$ and $\delta\phi_l$ can be represented, for wavelengths crossing out the Hubble radius, as classical random fields such that

$$\delta\phi_h = \frac{H(t_k)}{\sqrt{2k^3}} e_h(\mathbf{k}), \quad \delta\phi_l = \frac{H(t_k)}{\sqrt{2k^3}} e_l(\mathbf{k}), \quad (13)$$

where e_h and e_l are centered and normalized gaussian fields, i.e. $\langle e_h(\mathbf{k}) \rangle = 0$, $\langle e_h(\mathbf{k}) e_h(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')$ (and the same for e_l); t_k is the time when the

wavelength crosses the Hubble radius, i.e. when $k = 2\pi aH$. Inverting (12) then defines C_1 and C_3 as random gaussian fields.

During the matter era, $\Phi = (3/5)C_1$, which follows from the general solution (8). Defining the spectrum of any homogeneously and isotropically distributed random field $f(\mathbf{x})$ by $\langle f_{\mathbf{k}} f'_{\mathbf{k}'} \rangle = 2\pi^2 k^{-3} \mathcal{P}_f(k) \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')$, the spectrum for Φ today, can be found [13] to be, using (5):

$$\mathcal{P}_\Phi = \frac{6G}{25\pi} s^2 \left[m_h^2 + m_l^2 - (m_h^2 - m_l^2) \cos 2\theta(s) \right]. \quad (14)$$

s is taken at the time t_k , and since the variation of H during inflation is very small with respect to that of the scale factor, $s(k) \equiv s(t_k) \simeq \ln(k_e/k)$. This spectrum has two plateaus, as explained in [13]. Since, here, the transition scale is larger than the Hubble radius today, only the lower plateau, corresponding to the second phase of inflation (driven by the light scalar field), and given by the limit $\theta = 0$ of (14),

$$\mathcal{P}_\Phi = \frac{12}{25\pi} s^2 \frac{m_l^2}{m_P^2}, \quad (15)$$

will be accessible to observations. The most direct observational consequence of inflation-generated perturbations is the CMBR fluctuations at large angular scales. At these scales, the fluctuations are due mainly to the Sachs-Wolfe effect ([14]):

$$\left(\frac{\Delta T}{T} \right)_{SW}(\vec{e}) = \frac{1}{3} [\Phi_{ls} - \Phi_0] + \vec{e} \cdot [\vec{v}_{ls} - \vec{v}_0], \quad (16)$$

where $\vec{e}$ gives the direction of observation on the celestial sphere. The subscript ls refers to the last scattering surface and the subscript 0 to the observer today. Decomposing the CMBR fluctuations in spherical harmonics, the prediction for the harmonic components $l \geq 2$ on large angular scales, due to the Sachs-Wolfe effect, is

$$\Sigma_l^2 = \langle |a_{lm}|^2 \rangle = \frac{4\pi}{9} \int \frac{dk}{k} \mathcal{P}_\Phi(k) j_l^2(2k/a_0 H_0). \quad (17)$$

This formula is obtained by implicitly assuming that the contribution of the isocurvature perturbations to the harmonic components $l \geq 2$ is negligible (this is in general required for compatibility between CMBR and large scale structure observations, see e.g. [15]). The spectrum depends on the scale only logarithmically, and the multipoles can thus be obtained, with a good approximation, by using the expression for a flat spectrum:

$$a_l^2 \equiv \frac{2l+1}{4\pi} \Sigma_l^2 = \frac{6}{225\pi} \left(\frac{m_l}{m_P} \right)^2 \frac{2l+1}{l(l+1)} s_l^2, \quad (18)$$

where s_l is the value for s corresponding to $k = la_0H_0/2$, which contributes the most to the integral (17). The quadrupole $a_2 = (m_l/m_P)s_H/(3\sqrt{5\pi})$ must be adjusted to agree with the COBE measurement of $Q_{rms-PS}(n = 1) \simeq 18\mu K$ ([16]). Hence the constraint on the model:

$$\left(\frac{m_l}{m_P}\right)s_H \simeq 7.8 \times 10^{-5}. \quad (19)$$

If one takes $s_H = 60$, this gives $m_l \simeq 1.3 \times 10^{-6}m_P$.

In addition to adiabatic perturbations, this model can also produce isocurvature perturbations. This is the case for example if one assumes that the light scalar field, after inflation, will decay into ordinary matter, while the heavy scalar field remains decoupled from ordinary matter and will contribute to the cold dark matter. After inflation, there will then be two species: ordinary matter which behaves as radiation (its background energy density is denoted ρ_r and the perturbation $\delta\rho_r$) and the heavy scalar field particles, which behave as dust-like matter (with energy density $\rho_m + \delta\rho_m$). One must be careful to use comoving energy density perturbations, i.e. with respect to the frame where matter is at rest (see [5]). Then the isocurvature perturbation is defined by

$$S = \delta_m - \frac{3}{4}\delta_r, \quad (20)$$

with $\delta_m \equiv \delta\rho_m/\rho_m$, $\delta_r \equiv \delta\rho_r/\rho_r$. For the scalar field ϕ_h , the comoving energy density perturbation is given by

$$\delta\rho_h = \dot{\phi}_h\delta\dot{\phi}_h + m_h^2\phi_h\delta\phi_h + 3H\dot{\phi}_h\delta\phi_h - \dot{\phi}_h^2\Phi. \quad (21)$$

During inflation dominated by the light scalar field, the heavy scalar field still slow rolling, eq (12) implies that $\delta\phi_h = -\frac{2}{3}C_3m_h^2\phi_h$ (for the modes $k \ll aH$). Moreover, $\delta\phi_h$ satisfies the same equation as that for the background ϕ_h (because one can neglect the right-hand side of eq (10)) and one can thus use the constancy of $\delta\phi_h/\phi_h$ to match various periods. In particular, during the oscillating phase, $\phi_h \sim \delta\phi_h \sim a^{-3/2}\sin(m_h t + \gamma)$, and therefore $\delta_m = \delta\rho_h/\rho_h = 2\delta\phi_h/\phi_h = -(4/3)m_h^2C_3$. During the radiation era, $S \simeq \delta_m$ and the spectrum of S , which was given in [17], then follows from (12) and (13):

$$\mathcal{P}_S = \frac{H^2}{\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{\phi_h^2} + \frac{m_h^4}{m_l^4\phi_l^2} \right]. \quad (22)$$

When $\theta \ll 1$, the second term on the right hand side can be neglected and one finds, using (4) and (5),

$$\mathcal{P}_S = \frac{4G}{3\pi}m_l^2 \left(\frac{s_0}{s} \right)^{m_h^2/m_l^2}. \quad (23)$$

This expression is valid for scales crossing out the Hubble radius while ϕ_h is still slow-rolling, i.e. for $\lambda > \lambda_c$. One notices that the spectrum increases

when k increases. However, when ϕ_h stops slow-rolling, the production of isocurvature perturbations falls abruptly. This occurs when $H \sim m_h$, corresponding to $s = s_c \sim m_h^2/m_l^2$, and the isocurvature spectrum then reaches its maximum.

As emphasized in [5], the isocurvature modes remain constant during the evolution of the universe, *as long as they remain outside the Hubble radius*. This is the case for the modes that contribute to the dipole and the quadrupole of the CMBR. Therefore, the previous spectrum produced during inflation will remain the same until the last scattering, for the large scales.

Let us now consider the dipole generated by the perturbations larger than the present Hubble radius. As shown in [5] the crucial difference between the dipole and the other multipoles is that, for the dipole, the terms $\Phi/3$ and $\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ in the Sachs-Wolfe contribution will cancel each other. Therefore, even if the adiabatic perturbations are dominant for the multipoles $l \geq 2$, the isocurvature perturbations will dominate the dipole, because of their contribution to the intrinsic fluctuations

$$\left(\frac{\Delta T}{T}\right)_{int} \simeq -\frac{1}{3}S. \quad (24)$$

The corresponding expected dipole is thus

$$a_1^2 \equiv \frac{3}{4\pi} \Sigma_1^2 = \frac{1}{3} \int \frac{dk}{k} \mathcal{P}_S(k) j_1^2(2k/a_0 H_0), \quad (25)$$

Introducing the variable $X = \ln(k_c/k)$, this can be expressed more conveniently as

$$a_1^2 = \frac{16}{81\pi} \left(\frac{m_l}{m_P}\right)^2 e^{2(s_H - s_c)} \left(\frac{s_0}{s_c}\right)^{m_h^2/m_l^2} \int_0^\infty dX \frac{e^{-2X}}{(1 + X/s_c)^{m_h^2/m_l^2}}, \quad (26)$$

where has been used the fact that $j_1(x) \sim x/3$ for small x . The integral in (26) is well approximated as $(2 + (m_h/m_l)^2/s_c)^{-1}$. For consistency, one must also check that the quadrupole generated by isocurvature perturbations is smaller than the adiabatic quadrupole given in (18). This requires, as seen in [5], that

$$s_c > s_H + 4.6, \quad (27)$$

i.e. that the cut-off scale λ_c is one hundred times larger than the Hubble radius today. The value s_H is of the order of 60. Its exact value depends on the precise history of the universe since the end of inflation, as well as the value of the Hubble parameter at that time. Because of the power law dependence in (26), *the dipole can be much bigger than the quadrupole*. Because of the condition (27), implying that m_h^2/m_l^2 must be large, the main constraint, surprisingly, comes from requiring that the dipole is not too high with respect to the other multipoles. s_0/s_c must be very close to 1, which

implies that the two remaining free parameters of the model, s_0 and m_h , must be fine-tuned according to the relation

$$\left(\frac{s_0}{s_c}\right)^{m_h^2/2m_l^2} \sim \left(\frac{a_1}{a_2}\right) s_H e^{s_c - s_H}, \quad (28)$$

with $s_c \sim m_h^2/m_l^2$. The higher s_H , the more stringent the fine-tuning must be.

Note finally that the scenario presented here is not incompatible with the standard double inflation scenario, where the break between the two phases of inflation occurs at a scale well within the present Hubble radius: they can coexist if one considers three scalar fields, the intermediate (in mass) scalar field playing the role of the light scalar field in the scenario proposed here and of the massive scalar field in standard double inflation.

In conclusion, whereas previous alternative interpretations for the dipole invoke *preexisting* cosmological perturbations, the model proposed here is the first, to my knowledge, to provide a mechanism that *creates* these perturbations. It is possible that the required fine-tuning could be relaxed in a model more sophisticated than one with two non-interacting massive scalar fields. In any case, this work shows that the standard Doppler interpretation should not be taken for granted, and that further observational investigation is needed to decide conclusively about the origin of the CMBR dipole.

References

- [1] Lubin, P. M., Epstein, G. L., & Smoot, G. F., Phys. Rev. Lett., **50**, 616, (1983); Fixen, D., J., Chang, E. S. & Wilkinson, D. T., Phys. Rev. Lett., **50**, 620, (1983).
- [2] A. Kogut et al., Astrophys. J. 419, 1 (1993)
- [3] B. Paczynski, T. Piran, Astrophys. J. 364, 341 (1990)
- [4] M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D 44, 3737 (1991)
- [5] D. Langlois, T. Piran, “The CMBR dipole from an entropy gradient”, Phys. Rev. D 53, 2908 (1996)
- [6] Boldt, E., 1987, Phys Rep, **146**, 215.
- [7] Lynden-Bell, D., Lahav, O., & Burstein, 1989, MNRAS, **241**, 325.
- [8] Strauss, M., A., et al, 1992, ApJ, **397**, 395.
- [9] Riess, A., G., Press, W. H., Kirshner, R. P. (1994) preprint, astro-ph 9412017.

- [10] Lauer, T.R. & Postman, M. 1991, ApJ, **425**, 418.
- [11] L. Kofman, A.D. Linde, Nuclear Physics B 282, 555 (1987)
- [12] J. Silk, M.S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D 35, 419 (1987)
- [13] D. Polarski, A.A. Starobinsky, Nuclear Physics B 385, 623 (1992)
- [14] R.K. Sachs, A.M. Wolfe, Ap. J. 147, 73 (1967).
- [15] A. R. Liddle, D. H. Lyth, Physics Reports 231, 1 (1993)
- [16] A.J. Banday et al., submitted to Astrophys. J. Letters, astro-ph/9601065.
- [17] D. Polarski, A.A. Starobinsky, Phys. Rev. D50, 6123 (1994)